

## **General Disclaimer**

### **One or more of the Following Statements may affect this Document**

- This document has been reproduced from the best copy furnished by the organizational source. It is being released in the interest of making available as much information as possible.
- This document may contain data, which exceeds the sheet parameters. It was furnished in this condition by the organizational source and is the best copy available.
- This document may contain tone-on-tone or color graphs, charts and/or pictures, which have been reproduced in black and white.
- This document is paginated as submitted by the original source.
- Portions of this document are not fully legible due to the historical nature of some of the material. However, it is the best reproduction available from the original submission.



DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON

HOUSTON, TEXAS

CR 151338

(NASA-CR-151338) SUFFICIENT STATISTICS FOR  
MIXTURES OF MEASURES IN A HOMOGENEOUS FAMILY  
(Houston Univ.) 18 p HC A02/MF A01 CSCL 12A

N77-24887

G3/65 Unclas  
26140

SUFFICIENT STATISTICS  
FOR MIXTURES OF MEASURES  
IN A HOMOGENEOUS FAMILY  
BY CHARLES PETERS  
REPORT #64 MARCH 1977

PREPARED FOR  
EARTH OBSERVATION DIVISION, JSC  
UNDER  
CONTRACT NAS-9-15000



HOUSTON, TEXAS 77004

**Sufficient Statistics for Mixtures  
of Measures in a Homogeneous Family**

**By**

**Charles Peters  
Department of Mathematics  
University of Houston**

**March, 1977  
Report 64**

**Sufficient Statistics for Mixtures  
of Measures in a Homogeneous Family**

by

Charles Peters

Department of Mathematics

University of Houston

**1. Introduction:**

Let  $(X, \mathcal{A})$  and  $(Y, \mathcal{B})$  be measurable spaces and let  $T : X \rightarrow Y$  be surjective and measurable. Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a set of finite positive measures on  $(X, \mathcal{A})$ . For each  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$  there corresponds a measure  $\mu T^{-1}$  on  $(Y, \mathcal{B})$  defined for  $F \in \mathcal{B}$  by

$$\mu T^{-1}(F) = \mu(T^{-1}(F)).$$

If  $f$  is a  $\mu$ -integrable real valued function on  $X$ , then as a consequence of the Radon Nikodym Theorem, there is a  $\mu T^{-1}$ -integrable function  $e_\mu(f)$  on  $Y$  satisfying

$$\int_F e_\mu(f) d\mu T^{-1} = \int_{T^{-1}(F)} f d\mu$$

for each  $F \in \mathcal{B}$ . Clearly  $e_\mu(f)$  is defined only up to sets in  $Y$  of  $\mu T^{-1}$  measure 0 and  $f = g$  a.e. ( $\mu$ ) implies  $e_\mu(f) = e_\mu(g)$  a.e. ( $\mu T^{-1}$ ). The linear operator  $e_\mu$  defined as above maps the space  $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$  to the space  $\mathcal{L}^1(Y, \mathcal{B}, \mu T^{-1})$  and is called the conditional expectation operator. Its value

$e_\mu(f)$  at  $f \in \mathcal{L}'(X, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$  is called the conditional expectation of  $f$  given  $\mathcal{T}$ .

The conditional probability of an event  $E \in \mathcal{A}$  is defined as

$$P_\mu(E) = e_\mu(\chi_E)$$

where  $\chi_E$  is the indicator function of  $E$ . The conditional probability functions satisfy

$$(a) \quad P_\mu : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{J}(Y, \mathcal{B}, \mu T^{-1}).$$

where  $\mathcal{J}(Y, \mathcal{B}, \mu T^{-1})$  is the set of all real valued  $\mathcal{B}$ -measureable functions on  $Y$ , with equality defined as equality a.e.  $(\mu T^{-1})$ .

$$(b) \quad \text{For each } F \in \mathcal{B}, E \in \mathcal{A},$$

$$\mu(E \cap T^{-1}(F)) = \int_F P_\mu(E) d\mu T^{-1}$$

$$(c) \quad 0 \leq P_\mu(E) \leq 1 \text{ for each } E \in \mathcal{A} \text{ and } P_\mu(X) = 1.$$

$$(d) \quad \text{If } \{E_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \text{ is a disjoint sequence of events in } \mathcal{A},$$

$$P_\mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty E_n\right) = \sum_{n=1}^\infty P_\mu(E_n) \text{ a.e. } (\mu T^{-1}).$$

It should be noted that  $P_\mu$  satisfies property (c) even when  $\mu$  is not a probability measure.

The transformation  $T$  is called a sufficient statistic for  $\mathcal{M}$  if for each  $E \in \mathcal{A}$  there is a  $\mathcal{B}$ -measureable function  $P(E)$  on  $Y$  such that for each  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $P_\mu(E) = P(E)$  a.e.,  $(\mu T^{-1})$ . The set  $\mathcal{M}$  is dominated by a measure  $\lambda$  (perhaps not in  $\mathcal{M}$ ) if for each  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $\mu$  is absolutely

continuous with respect to  $\lambda$ , (written  $\mu \ll \lambda$ .)  $\mathcal{M}$  is homogeneous if it is dominated by each of its members. A measure  $\lambda$  is equivalent to  $\mathcal{M}$  if  $\lambda$  dominates  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mu(E) = 0$  for each  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$  implies  $\lambda(E) = 0$ .

The notation and terminology used in this paper are taken from (Halmos and Savage; 1949), as are the following three theorems. The notation  $\frac{d\mu}{d\lambda}(\epsilon)T^{-1}(\mathcal{B})$  means that there is an element of the equivalence class  $\frac{d\mu}{d\lambda}$  of Radon-Nikodym derivatives which is  $T^{-1}(\mathcal{B})$  measurable.

Theorem 1: If  $\mathcal{M}$  is dominated, then a statistic  $T$  is sufficient for  $\mathcal{M}$  if and only if there exists a measure  $\lambda$  equivalent to  $\mathcal{M}$  such that for each  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $\frac{d\mu}{d\lambda}(\epsilon)T^{-1}(\mathcal{B})$ .

Theorem 2: If  $\mathcal{M}$  is dominated, then a statistic  $T$  is sufficient for  $\mathcal{M}$  if and only if  $T$  is sufficient for each pair  $\{\mu, \nu\}$  of elements of  $\mathcal{M}$ .

Theorem 3: If  $\mathcal{M}$  is homogeneous, then a statistic  $T$  is sufficient for  $\mathcal{M}$  if and only if  $\frac{d\mu}{d\nu}(\epsilon)T^{-1}(\mathcal{B})$  for each  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}$ .

## 2. Homogeneous Families:

Henceforth, we will assume that  $\mathcal{M}$  is homogeneous. Let  $C(\mathcal{M})$  denote the cone generated by  $\mathcal{M}$ , excluding the zero measure. That is,  $C(\mathcal{M})$  is the set of all finite linear combinations, with strictly positive coefficients, of elements of  $\mathcal{M}$ . Elements of  $C(\mathcal{M})$  are termed mixtures of elements of  $\mathcal{M}$ . Clearly,  $C(\mathcal{M})$  is also homogeneous; hence, the spaces  $\mathcal{F}(Y, \mathcal{B}, \mu T^{-1})$  are all the same for  $\mu \in C(\mathcal{M})$  and may be denoted simply by  $\mathcal{F}$ . For  $\mu \in C(\mathcal{M})$ ,  $P_\mu$  maps  $\mathcal{A}$  to  $\mathcal{F}$  and it is clear from the definition of a sufficient statistic that  $T$  is sufficient for a subset  $\mathcal{N}$  of  $C(\mathcal{M})$  if and only if the conditional probability

functions  $P_\mu$  for  $\mu \in \mathcal{N}$  are all equal.

Lemma 4: If  $\mathcal{M}$  is dominated,  $\mathcal{N} \subset C(\mathcal{M})$ , and  $T$  is sufficient for  $\mathcal{M}$ , then  $T$  is sufficient for  $\mathcal{N}$ .

Proof: Let  $\lambda$  be that measure equivalent to  $\mathcal{M}$  whose existence is assured by Theorem 1. If  $\mu \in C(\mathcal{M})$ , then  $\mu$  can be written

$$\mu = \sum_{i=1}^k \beta_i \nu_i$$

with  $\beta_i > 0$ ,  $\nu_i \in \mathcal{M}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ . Hence,

$$\frac{d\mu}{d\lambda} = \sum_{i=1}^k \beta_i \frac{d\nu_i}{d\lambda} \quad (\epsilon) T^{-1}(\mathcal{B}).$$

Thus  $T$  is sufficient for  $C(\mathcal{M})$  and hence is sufficient for  $\mathcal{N}$ .

In order to characterize sufficient statistics for  $\mathcal{N} \subset C(\mathcal{M})$ , it suffices, by Theorem 2, to consider a pair

$$\mu_I = \sum_{i \in I} \beta_i \mu_i$$

and

$$\mu_J = \sum_{j \in J} \beta_j \mu_j$$

in  $\mathcal{M}$ , where  $I$  and  $J$  are finite sets;  $\beta_k > 0$  for  $k \in I \cup J$ ; and the measures  $\{\mu_i\}_{i \in I}$  are distinct members of  $\mathcal{M}$ , as are the measures  $\{\mu_j\}_{j \in J}$ .

The set  $C(\ )$  of all finite mixtures of elements of  $\mathcal{M}$  is said to be identifiable (Teicher, 1960, 1961; Yakowitz 1969) if each element of  $C(\mathcal{M})$  can be expressed in only one way as a linear combination with positive coefficients of elements of  $\mathcal{M}$ , except for the order of the summands. Equivalently,  $C(\mathcal{M})$  is identifiable if the set  $\mathcal{M}$  is linearly independent over the real numbers.

The concept of identifiability is very important in establishing the uniqueness and consistency of various estimators of the so called mixing parameters  $\{\beta_i : i \in I\}$  in a mixture  $\mu_I$  (Yakowitz, 1969).

Given a mixture  $\mu_I$  in  $C(\mathcal{M})$  we have for each  $E \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $F \in \mathcal{B}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_F P_{\mu_I}(E) d\mu_I T^{-1} &= \mu_I(E \cap T^{-1}(F)) \\ &= \sum_{i \in I} \beta_i \mu_i(E \cap T^{-1}(F)) \\ &= \sum_{i \in I} \beta_i \int_F P_{\mu_i}(E) d\mu_i T^{-1} \\ &= \sum_{i \in I} \beta_i \int_F P_{\mu_i}(E) \frac{d\mu_i T^{-1}}{d\mu_I T^{-1}} d\mu_I T^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $I_1, \dots, I_r$  be the equivalence classes in  $I$  modulo the relation  $i \equiv k$  if and only if  $P_{\mu_i} = P_{\mu_k}$ ; that is, if and only if  $T$  is sufficient for the pair  $\{\mu_i, \mu_k\}$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in I} \beta_i \int_F P_{\mu_i}(E) \frac{d\mu_i T^{-1}}{d\mu_I T^{-1}} d\mu_I T^{-1} \\ = \int_F \sum_{\ell=1}^r \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \beta_i \frac{d\mu_i T^{-1}}{d\mu_I T^{-1}} P_{\mu_{I_\ell}}(E) d\mu_I T^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $P_{\mu_{I_\ell}}(E)$  is the common value of the  $P_{\mu_i}(E)$  for  $i \in I_\ell$ . Thus,

$$P_{\mu_I} = \sum_{\ell=1}^r \frac{d\mu_{I_\ell} T^{-1}}{d\mu_I T^{-1}} P_{\mu_{I_\ell}}$$



where  $\mu_{I_\ell}$  is the mixture

$$\mu_{I_\ell} = \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \beta_i \mu_i$$

Whenever the conditional probability function  $P_{\mu_I}$  of a mixture  $\mu_I$  is written in this fashion with  $I_1, \dots, I_r$  being equivalence classes modulo the relation  $\equiv$ , we will say that  $P_{\mu_I}$  is written in normal form.

**Definition 5:** The set  $C(\mathcal{M})$  is conditionally identifiable with respect to the statistic  $T$  if for each pair  $\{\mu_I, \mu_J\}$  in  $C(\mathcal{M})$ , whenever  $P_{\mu_I} = P_{\mu_J}$  and  $P_{\mu_I}, P_{\mu_J}$  are expressed in normal form

$$P_{\mu_I} = \sum_{\ell=1}^r \frac{d\mu_{I_\ell} T^{-1}}{d\mu_I T^{-1}} P_{\mu_{I_\ell}}$$

$$P_{\mu_J} = \sum_{k=1}^s \frac{d\mu_{J_k} T^{-1}}{d\mu_J T^{-1}} P_{\mu_{J_k}},$$

then  $r = s$  and for each  $\ell = 1, \dots, r$  there exists exactly one  $k = 1, \dots, r$

such that  $\frac{d\mu_{I_\ell} T^{-1}}{d\mu_I T^{-1}} = \frac{d\mu_{J_k} T^{-1}}{d\mu_J T^{-1}}$  and  $P_{\mu_{I_\ell}} = P_{\mu_{J_k}}$ . The set  $C(\mathcal{M})$  is

marginally identifiable with respect to  $T$  if the set  $\{\mu T^{-1} | \mu \in \mathcal{M}\}$  is linearly independent over the real numbers.

**Theorem 6:** If  $C(\mathcal{M})$  is both marginally identifiable and conditionally identifiable with respect to a statistic  $T$ , then  $C(\mathcal{M})$  is identifiable.

**Proof:** Suppose  $\mu_I = \sum_{i \in I} \beta_i \mu_i = \sum_{j \in J} \beta_j \mu_j = \mu_J$ , where the measures in each sum are distinct members of  $\mathcal{M}$ . Then, expressed in normal form,

$$P_{\mu_I} = \sum_{\ell=1}^r \frac{d\mu_I T^{-1}}{d\mu_I T^{-1}} P_{\mu_{I_\ell}} = \sum_{\ell=1}^r \frac{d\mu_J T^{-1}}{d\mu_J T^{-1}} P_{\mu_{J_\ell}} = P_{\mu_J},$$

and we may assume without loss of generality that

$$\frac{d\mu_I T^{-1}}{d\mu_I T^{-1}} = \frac{d\mu_J T^{-1}}{d\mu_J T^{-1}}$$

and

$$P_{\mu_{I_\ell}} = P_{\mu_{J_\ell}} \quad \text{for } \ell = 1, \dots, r.$$

Since  $\mu_I T^{-1} = \mu_J T^{-1}$ , it follows that  $\mu_{I_\ell} T^{-1} = \mu_{J_\ell} T^{-1}$ . For  $i, k \in I_\ell$ ,

$\mu_i T^{-1} \neq \mu_k T^{-1}$ , for otherwise, since  $P_{\mu_i} = P_{\mu_k}$ , we would have  $\mu_i = \mu_k$ ,

contradicting the assumption that  $\{\mu_i : i \in I\}$  are distinct. Similarly, the

$\mu_j T^{-1}$  for  $j \in J_\ell$  are all distinct. Since  $C(\mathcal{M})$  is marginally identifiable,

$I_\ell$  and  $J_\ell$  have the same number of elements and for each  $i \in I_\ell$  there is

a unique  $j(i) \in J_\ell$  such that  $\beta_i = \beta_{j(i)}$  and  $\mu_i T^{-1} = \mu_{j(i)} T^{-1}$ . Since

$P_{\mu_i} = P_{\mu_{j(i)}}$ , it follows that  $\mu_i = \mu_{j(i)}$  for each  $i \in I_\ell$ . Therefore,

there is one to one map  $j$  from  $I$  onto  $J$  such that  $\beta_{j(i)} = \beta_i$  and

$\mu_{j(i)} = \mu_i$  for each  $i \in I$ . Hence,  $C(\mathcal{M})$  is identifiable, and the proof

is complete.

For conditionally identifiable sets of measures, the following theorem and its corollary provide some characterizations of sufficient statistics.

**Theorem 7:** If  $\mathcal{M}$  is homogeneous,  $C(\mathcal{M})$  is conditionally identifiable with respect to a statistic  $T$ , and  $\mu_I, \mu_J$  are in  $C(\mathcal{M})$ , then  $T$  is sufficient for the pair  $\mu_I, \mu_J$  if and only if there exist partitions

$I = I_1 \cup \dots \cup I_r$  and  $J = J_1 \cup \dots \cup J_r$  such that for each  $\ell = 1, \dots, r$ :

$$(a) \quad d\left(\sum_{i \in I_\ell} \beta_i \mu_i\right) / d\left(\sum_{j \in J_\ell} \beta_j \mu_j\right) = \frac{d\mu_{I_\ell}}{d\mu_{J_\ell}} = \frac{d\mu_I}{d\mu_J}$$

and

(b)  $T$  is sufficient for the set  $N_\ell = \{\mu_k : k \in I_\ell \cup J_\ell\}$ .

Proof: First suppose such partitions exist. By (b)  $T$  is sufficient for the set  $N_1$  and hence, by lemma 4, it is sufficient for the pair  $\{\mu_{I_1}, \mu_{J_1}\}$ . It follows from (a) and Theorem 3 that  $T$  is sufficient for the pair  $\{\mu_I, \mu_J\}$ .

Suppose that  $T$  is sufficient for the pair  $\{\mu_I, \mu_J\}$ . Then, expressed in normal form,

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^r \frac{d\mu_{I_\ell} T^{-1}}{d\mu_I T^{-1}} P_{\mu_{I_\ell}} = \sum_{\ell=1}^r \frac{d\mu_{J_\ell} T^{-1}}{d\mu_J T^{-1}} P_{\mu_{J_\ell}},$$

and we may assume without loss of generality that

$$\frac{d\mu_{I_\ell} T^{-1}}{d\mu_I T^{-1}} = \frac{d\mu_{J_\ell} T^{-1}}{d\mu_J T^{-1}} \text{ and } P_{\mu_{I_\ell}} = P_{\mu_{J_\ell}} \text{ for each } \ell.$$

The condition  $P_{\mu_{I_\ell}} = P_{\mu_{J_\ell}}$  is equivalent to (b). By Theorem 3, there exists a

representative  $f \in \frac{d\mu_I}{d\mu_J}$  which is  $T^{-1}(\mathcal{B})$  measurable. If  $g \in \frac{d\mu_I T^{-1}}{d\mu_J T^{-1}}$ , then  $g \circ T$  is  $T^{-1}(\mathcal{B})$  measurable and for each  $F \in \mathcal{B}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{T^{-1}(F)} g \circ T \, d\mu_J &= \int_F g \, d\mu_J T^{-1} = \mu_I T^{-1}(F) \\ &= \int_{T^{-1}(F)} f \, d\mu_J \end{aligned}$$

It follows that  $g \cdot T = f$  a.e.  $(\mu_J)$ . Thus,

$$\frac{d\mu_I T^{-1}}{d\mu_J T^{-1}} \cdot T = \{g \cdot T \mid g \in \frac{d\mu_I T^{-1}}{d\mu_J T^{-1}}\} \subset \frac{d\mu_I}{d\mu_J}.$$

Since  $T$  is also sufficient for the pair  $(\mu_{I_\ell}, \mu_{J_\ell})$ , a similar argument gives

$$\frac{d\mu_{I_\ell} T^{-1}}{d\mu_{J_\ell} T^{-1}} \cdot T \subset \frac{d\mu_{I_\ell}}{d\mu_{J_\ell}}$$

for each  $\ell$ . Since  $\frac{d\mu_{I_\ell} T^{-1}}{d\mu_{J_\ell} T^{-1}} = \frac{d\mu_I T^{-1}}{d\mu_J T^{-1}}$  for each  $\ell$ , it follows that (a)

holds for each  $\ell$  and the proof is complete.

**Corollary 8:** If  $\mathcal{M}$  is homogeneous and  $C(\mathcal{M})$  is conditionally identifiable with respect to a statistic  $T$ , then  $T$  is sufficient for a pair  $(\mu_I, \mu_J)$  in  $C(\mathcal{M})$  if and only if there exist subsets  $I_1 \subset I$  and  $J_1 \subset J$  such that:

$$(a) \quad \frac{d\mu_{I_1}}{d\mu_{J_1}} = \frac{d\mu_I}{d\mu_J}$$

and

$$(b) \quad T \text{ is sufficient for } N = \{\mu_k : k \in I_1 \cup J_1\}.$$

**Proof:** That  $T$  sufficient implies the existence of  $I_1$  and  $J_1$  satisfying

(a) and (b) is immediate from Theorem 7. Conversely if  $I_1$  and  $J_1$  satisfy

(a) and (b), then  $T$  is sufficient for  $\mu_{I_1}, \mu_{J_1}$  by (b) and hence, by (a),  $T$  is sufficient for  $\mu_I, \mu_J$ .

Given a pair of mixtures  $\mu_I, \mu_J$  in  $C(\mathcal{M})$ , we will call their likelihood ratio  $\frac{d\mu_I}{d\mu_J}$  indecomposable if  $I_1 \subset I, J_1 \subset J$  and

$\frac{d\mu_{I_1}}{d\mu_{J_1}} = \frac{d\mu_I}{d\mu_J}$  imply  $I_1 = I$  and  $J_1 = J$ . It is clear from Theorem 7 that

if  $C(\mathcal{M})$  is conditionally identifiable with respect to  $T$  and a pair of mixtures  $\mu_I, \mu_J$  in  $C(\mathcal{M})$  have an indecomposable likelihood ratio, then  $T$  is sufficient for  $\{\mu_I, \mu_J\}$  if and only if it is sufficient for  $\{\mu_k : k \in I \cup J\}$ . Also, it is not difficult to see that for each pair  $\mu_I, \mu_J$  in  $C(\mathcal{M})$  there exist nonempty subsets  $I_1 \subset I$  and  $J_1 \subset J$  such that

$$\frac{d\mu_{I_1}}{d\mu_{J_1}} = \frac{d\mu_I}{d\mu_J}$$

and the likelihood ratio  $\frac{d\mu_{I_1}}{d\mu_{J_1}}$  is indecomposable. If  $\mu_I$  and  $\mu_J$  represent the probability laws for two alternative hypotheses, then there would be two advantages in being able to identify subsets  $I_1$  and  $J_1$  satisfying these two criteria. First, the maximum likelihood decision procedure would be simplified, and second, the search for a statistic sufficient for deciding between the two hypotheses and having the property that  $C(\mathcal{M})$  is conditionally identifiable could be restricted to those statistics sufficient for  $\{\mu_k : k \in I_1 \cup J_1\}$ .

### 3. Sufficient Linear Statistics for Mixtures of Normals:

If  $\mathcal{R}$  is a subring of the ring  $\mathcal{J}$  introduced in Section 2, then with the

usual definition of addition and multiplication by elements of  $\mathcal{K}$  the set of all functions  $\phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{J}$  is a module over  $\mathcal{K}$ . Thus, it is natural to consider  $\mathcal{K}$ -independence of a set  $\mathcal{L}$  of such functions. To be precise,  $\mathcal{L}$  is  $\mathcal{K}$ -independent if whenever  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_m$  is a finite set of distinct elements of  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_m$  are elements of  $\mathcal{K}$  such that

$$\gamma_1 \phi_1(E) + \dots + \gamma_m \phi_m(E) = 0 \text{ for each } E \in \mathcal{A},$$

then  $\gamma_1 = \dots = \gamma_m = 0$ . If  $\mathcal{K}$  is a subring of  $\mathcal{J}$  which contains all the bound Radon-Nikodym derivatives  $\frac{d\mu_T^{-1}}{d\nu_T^{-1}}$  for  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})$ , then it is clear that  $\mathcal{K}$ -independence of the set  $\{P_\mu : \mu \in \mathcal{M}\}$  implies that  $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})$  is conditionally identifiable with respect to  $T$ .

For the remainder of this section we will assume that  $X$  is  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $Y$  is  $\mathbb{R}^k$  ( $k \leq n$ ) and  $T : X \rightarrow Y$  is linear and full rank.  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  are respectively, the Borel fields on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\mathbb{R}^k$ . We also assume that each  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$  is described by a normal density function  $f_\mu$  with mean  $m_\mu$  and covariance  $\Omega_\mu$ . That is, for each  $E \in \mathcal{A}$ ,

$$\mu(E) = \int_E f_\mu d\lambda_n,$$

where  $\lambda_n$  is Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

By a suitable choice of the coordinate system, we may represent the densities  $f_\mu$  as joint density functions  $f_\mu(y, z)$  on  $\mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$  while representing  $T$  as the projection  $T(y, z) = y$ . Then the marginal densities

$$g_\mu(y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-k}} f_\mu(y, z) dz$$

are normal with means  $Tm_\mu$  and covariance matrices  $T\Omega_\mu T^1$  (Anderson, 1958).

The conditional density functions

$$h_{\mu}(z | y) = \frac{f_{\mu}(y, z)}{g_{\mu}(y)}$$

are normal as functions of  $z \in \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$  with means

$$(1) \quad S m_{\mu} + S \Omega_{\mu}^{-1} (T \Omega_{\mu}^{-1})^{-1} (y - T m_{\mu})$$

and covariances

$$(2) \quad S \Omega_{\mu}^{-1} - S \Omega_{\mu}^{-1} (T \Omega_{\mu}^{-1})^{-1} T \Omega_{\mu}^{-1}.$$

where  $S$  is the linear operator  $S(y, z) = z$ . The conditional probabilities

$P_{\mu}(E)$  are represented by

$$P_{\mu}(E | y) = \int_{S_y(E)} h_{\mu}(z | y) dz.$$

where  $S_y(E) = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^{n-k} \mid (y, z) \in E\}$ .

**Theorem 9:** If  $\mathcal{M}$  is a family of Borel measures on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  given by  $n$ -variate normal density functions and  $T: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  is linear of rank  $k$ , then  $C(\mathcal{M})$  is conditionally identifiable with respect to  $T$ .

**Proof:** It can readily be verified that conditional identifiability of  $C(\mathcal{M})$  is not affected by the change of variables just described. If  $\mu_I$  and  $\mu_J$  are in  $C(\mathcal{M})$ , then the Radon-Nikodym derivative  $\frac{d\mu_I}{d\mu_J} T^{-1}$  is represented by a

function of the form

$$\frac{g_I(y)}{g_J(y)} \sim \sum_{i \in I} \beta_i g_{\mu_i}(y) / \sum_{j \in J} \beta_j g_{\mu_j}(y);$$

i.e., a ratio of mixtures of  $k$ -variate normal density functions, which is continuous. Hence, by the remarks in the first paragraph of this section, it suffices to show that the set  $\{P_\mu: \mu \in \mathcal{M}\}$  of conditional density functions is  $\mathcal{R}$ -independent, where  $\mathcal{R}$  is the subring of  $\mathcal{F}$  consisting of those elements of  $\mathcal{F}$  which have a continuous representative. To this end, let  $P_{\mu_1}, \dots, P_{\mu_r}$  be distinct and let  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_r$  be continuous real valued functions on  $\mathbb{R}^k$  such that for each  $E \in \mathcal{A}$ ,

$$\gamma_1(y)P_{\mu_1}(E|y) + \dots + \gamma_r(y)P_{\mu_r}(E|y) = 0$$

for almost all  $y$ . In particular, choosing for  $E$  sets of the form  $\mathbb{R}^k \times K$ , where  $K$  is a borel set in  $\mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ , we have

$$\gamma_1(y) \int_K h_{\mu_1}(z|y) dz + \dots + \gamma_r(y) \int_K h_{\mu_r}(z|y) dz = 0$$

for almost all  $y$ . For each  $K$ ,  $\int_K h_{\mu_1}(z|y) dz$  is a continuous function of  $y$ . Hence,

$$\int_K (\gamma_1(y)h_{\mu_1}(z|y) + \dots + \gamma_r(y)h_{\mu_r}(z|y)) dz = 0$$

for each  $y \in \mathbb{R}^k$ . It follows that

$$\gamma_1(y)h_{\mu_1}(z|y) + \dots + \gamma_r(y)h_{\mu_r}(z|y) = 0$$

for each  $y \in \mathbb{R}^k$ ,  $z \in \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ . Let  $F$  be the set of  $y \in \mathbb{R}^k$  where two or more of the conditional density functions  $h_{\mu_1}(z|y)$  are equal as functions



of  $z$ . It is easily seen from (1) and (2) that the Lebesgue measure of  $F$  is zero. For  $y \notin F$ ,  $\{h_{\mu_1}(\cdot|y), \dots, h_{\mu_r}(\cdot|y)\}$  is a set of distinct normal density functions of  $z$ . Hence, (Yakowitz and Spragins; 1968), they are linearly independent over the real numbers. Therefore, for  $y \notin F$ ,  $\gamma_1(y) = \dots = \gamma_r(y) = 0$ . That is,  $\gamma_1 = \dots = \gamma_r = 0$  as elements of  $\mathcal{F}$ . Thus,  $C(\mathcal{M})$  is conditionally identifiable.

If  $\mu_I = \sum_{i \in I} \beta_i \mu_i$  is in  $C(\mathcal{M})$ , then  $\mu_I$  has a density function

$$f_{\mu_I} = \sum_{i \in I} \beta_i f_{\mu_i}$$

which is a mixture of normal density functions. The following theorem is an immediate consequence of Theorems 7 and 9.

**Theorem 10:** Given the assumptions of Theorem 9, the statistic  $T$  is sufficient for a pair  $\{\mu_I, \mu_J\}$  in  $C(\mathcal{M})$  if and only if there exist partitions  $I = I_1 \cup \dots \cup I_r$  and  $J = J_1 \cup \dots \cup J_r$  such that for each  $\ell = 1, \dots, r$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (a) \quad & \frac{\sum_{i \in I_\ell} \beta_i f_{\mu_i}(x)}{\sum_{j \in J_\ell} \beta_j f_{\mu_j}(x)} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{i \in I} \beta_i f_{\mu_i}(x)}{\sum_{j \in J} \beta_j f_{\mu_j}(x)} \text{ for each } x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \end{aligned}$$

and

(b)  $T$  is sufficient for the family  $\{f_{\mu_k} : k \in I_\ell \cup J_\ell\}$  of normal density functions.

There is set of purely algebraic conditions which are equivalent to (b);

namely, that the expressions

$$\Omega_{\mu_k} - \Omega_{\mu_k} T^1 (T \Omega_{\mu_k} T^1)^{-1} T \Omega_{\mu_k}$$

$$m_{\mu_k} - \Omega_{\mu_k} T^1 (T \Omega_{\mu_k} T^1)^{-1} T m_{\mu_k}$$

$$\Omega_{\mu_k} T^1 (T \Omega_{\mu_k} T^1)^{-1}$$

are all independent of  $k \in I_\ell \cup J_\ell$  (Peters, Redner, and Decell; 1976).

## REFERENCES

1. Anderson, T.W. (1958). An Introduction to Multivariate Statistical Analysis. John Wiley and Sons. New York.
2. Bahadur, R.R. (1954). Sufficiency and statistical decision functions. Ann. Math. Statist. 25, 423-463.
3. Halmos, P.R. and Savage L.J. (1949). Application of the Radon-Nikodym theorem to the theory of sufficient statistics. Ann. Math. Statist. 20, 225-241.
4. Peters, B.C., Redner R., and Decell, H.P. (1976). Characterizations of linear sufficient statistics. Tech. Report no. 59, Department of Mathematics , University of Houston.
5. Teicher, H. (1961). Identifiability of mixtures. Ann. Math. Statist. 32, 244-248.
6. Teicher, H. (1963). Identifiability of finite mixtures. Ann. Math. Statist. 34, 1265-1269.
7. Yakowitz, S. and Spragins, J. (1968). On the identifiability of finite mixtures. Ann. Math. Statist. 39, 209-214.
8. Yakowitz, S. (1969). A consistent estimator for the identification of finite mixtures. Ann. Math. Statist. 4D, 1728-1735.